In the name of India and its Emperor I beseech every Indian Civil servant to go through these pages once.

Kh. K. D

Attitude of Muslims

IN INDIA TOWARDS

BRITISH GOVERNMENT

AND OTHER MUSLIM AND NON-MUSLIM POWERS

BY

KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN, B.A.,

Pleader, Chief Court, Punjab,

LAHORE.

LAHORE

"Artistic Printing Works."

1912.

www.aaiil.org

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

نحمده و نصلی علی رسوله الکریم

Muslim Attitude towards the Powers that Be.

(An Extract from "The Review of Religions," a monthly Journal of the Ahmadiah Movement, Qadian.)

Khawaja Kamal-ud-Din B.A., LL.B., a distinguished member of the Ahmadiyya sect, is delivering at Lahore a series of lectures on "What the Muslims should do now." Three lectures of this series have already been delivered and in each lecture the able lecturer dwelt upon a particular subject. The subject of his third lecture which was listened to with rapt attention by an assembly of about 5,000 persons, was "Attitude of Muslims towards the British Government and other Muslim and non-Muslim powers." He began by referring to the various institutions of Islam and emphasised the fact that they were not mere ceremonies or acts of worship, but were based on principles of great wisdom and were calculated to promote the formation of high morals and engender a deep sense of citizenship. Having discussed the uses of, and the principles underlying, the various Islamic institutions, the lecturer drew the attention of the audience to the Friday prayer and the sermon delivered on the occasion. He declared the Friday prayer and sermon to be so important an institution that if its significance was fully realised by a Muslim, and if the great lesson which it embodied was taken to heart by him, he would not only become a good

citizen but also a most devoted subject of the government under which he was placed. The lecturer said—

Though the real significance of the Friday service is gradually being lost sight of, yet it is gratifying to note that our Maulawies have not forgotten the verse which the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) made a point of reciting every Friday in his sermon from the pulpit and which is consequently recited to this day. The verse runs thus—

ا ن ا لله يا مر با لعد ل و ا لا حسا ن و ا يتا ي ذ ى ا لقر بى
و ينهى عن ا لفحشاء و ا لمنكر و ا لبغى (نحل ١٣)

'Verily God enjoineth justice, the doing of good, and the giving unto kindred; and He forbiddeth immorality, wrong, and revolt." (xvi, 92).

In this verse, the believers are commanded to do three things and to abstain from three things. They are bidden firstly, to deal by one another with justice; secondly, to show active kindness to others, and thirdly, to love others as one loves those that are united to him by the close ties of blood. Corresponding to these three deeds of virtue, there are three acts from which he is bidden to refrain. He is to shun all obscene and immoral deeds; he is not to infringe the rights of others or wrong them in any way. As in our dealings with one another, the best act is the bestowment of gifts upon our kindred similarly the greatest evil which upsets the whole order of society is rising against the goverñment o f the country.

My educated friends, both Muslims and non-Muslims, you must have read many books on ethics and civilization, and many learned and elaborate disquisitions on sociology. You will have also known learned scholars discussing the ways by following which men can live in peace with one another. But I can assert

with the surest certainty that you will not find any parallel to the concise and comprehensive way in which the Holy Quran has dealt with this questiou in a single short verse. And one can not but admire the choice of this verse by the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) for recital during Friday service, so that it is now held as an indispensable part of the sermon that is delivered every Friday from the pulpit. If the whole world act upon this single verse, all troubles, immoralities and crimes will at once disappear. Consult the criminal and penal code of any country and you will find that all the laws therein are classifiable under three heads. Firstly there are the laws relating to morals that pertain to an individual personally. The object of these laws is to check individuals from committing such evil deeds as affect their own persons. Next come the laws which protect the rights of the members of a society in their relation to one another. These rights pertain to person, life and property. But these laws can never be enforced unless there are other laws to protect the rights and honour of the enforcers of those laws, *i.e.*, laws safeguarding the authority and prestige of the government of the day. You will find by reference to the second part of the above verse that it deals with the very three matters to which the aforesaid laws refer. The Holy Quran says, "He forbiddeth immorality, wrong, and revolt." The first thing forbidden is فحشاء which signifies such evil deeds as pertain to the personal morals of a man. The next thing forbidden is منكر *i.e.*, such acts as involve a wrong to our fellow creatures. Lastly we are commanded not to resist the laws of the government which have been framed to protect the rights of the subject people. The word بغي is a comprehensive term which not only includes the sense of the word sedition, but also applies to all those acts which are calculated to threaten the stability of a government established by law in a country.

One of the methods followed by the Holy Quran is that, when it inculcates good deeds, it begins with lowest virtues and then it proceeds to inculcate higher and higher virtues by degrees. It follows the same course in forbidding evil deeds. It takes the lesser evils first and the greater evils afterwards. Thus an evil that is put last must be held as the greatest evil. It is this order that has been followed in the verse in question. The Holy Quran first mentions that evil the effect of which is limited to the doer himself. Then it forbids the evil which affects other individuals of a society. Lastly comes the evil which upsets the peace and order of the whole country. This is the evil of بغي or rising in revolt against the Government of the country.

Such is the significance of the verse which is regarded as an indispensable part of the service held every Friday. Can you name any other book, religion or society which has established an institution that aims at enjoining upon its followers or members the necessity of not only being personally moral but also respecting the rights of others and of yielding mplicit obedience to the laws of the Government of the country. Such an institution is found in Islam and in no other religion or society. A community the members of which are exhorted every seventh day to abstain from disobedience to the laws of the government and to which sedition and disobedience to the government are represented as the greatest evil does not stand in need of any popular leader to exhort it to be loyal and obedient to its rulers and to avoid the paths of sedition and disobedience. No lectures need be delivered and no mass meetings need be held to enumerate before its members the benefits of the Government. Such a community may well dispense with the services of distinguished personages to disabuse their minds of seditious ideas.

While the latter half of the said verse forbids evils which

are calculated to disturb the peace of a society, the former half inculcates virtues the observance of which will make a society much better than even the ideal society depicted in More's Utopia. The Holy Quran says, "Verily God enjoineth justice, the doing of good, and the giving unto the kindred." Here we are first of all required to be at least just, *i.e.*, we must give every man at least his due and must return the kindness which others do to us. Justice requires us to faithfully repay our obligations to others. It must, however, be remembered that mere justice, which requires us to give to others just their due can not be classed with morals of the highest type. It, on the other hand, stands lowest in the scale of human morals. It is certainly inferior to *ihsan* or beneficence. The former requires us only to return good for good while the latter includes all those acts of kindness which are performed gratuitously. A beneficent being does good to others not to repay any good done to him; he does so spontaneously. But though the kindness done by a benefactor is gratuitous, yet he naturally expects from the recipient of his favours at least a moral reward in the form of gratitude. He wishes the person whom he has done a good turn to feel thankful to him. He is liable to be displeased if the other party prove to be wanting in gratitude. Nay, he is even apt to remind him of his good offices. If a benefactor yields to such weakness, it does not matter much. But it is not praiseworthy either. If in the case of justice we reciprocate the kindness of others, in the case of *Ihsan* (beneficence) also we wish for a reward though that reward be in the form of gratitude. But the Holy Quran requires us to rise above this. It wants us to banish from our minds all desire for reward or gratitude. It bids us to do good to others even if we have received no benefit from them, and even when there is no hope of our ever being benefitted by them in the future. We are required to render a good turn even to one whom we know to be lacking in gratitude. We should show kindness to others

for kindness's own sake without expecting any reward or gratitude. And it is not impossible to do so. Do not the parents show such kindness to children? Do not good men render truly magnanimous service to their parents and other members of their families? It is for this reason that the Holy Quran describes this highest form of kindness as إيتاء ذي القربى or the giving unto the kindred. It bids us not only to be just and beneficent to others but also to love others as one loves one's kinsmen.

Have you read this teaching expressed so tersely in any other book? You will not find these precepts so admirably expressed in the work of any philosopher, any ethical treatise or the writing of any *Muni or Rishi*. Nay, you will not find this teaching embodied in such an excellent form even in the words of any other prophet. But the verse of the Holy Quran in which these sublime teachings are so matchlessly expressed is rehearsed before congregations of Muslims every Friday.

It should also be borne in mind that in the exercise of these noble virtues we are strictly prohibited from making any distinction of creed or colour. The least of the virtues inculcated in the said verse is justice and what God says of the lowest form of virtue is, according to the usage of the Holy Quran, more true of the higher forms. In connection with justice God says, "Let not ill-will against any people induce you to act unjustly; act justly, next will this be to the fear of God. And fear ye God; verily God is apprised of what ye do." (v, 11). Here the Muslims are enjoined to deal justly even by those people that are inimical to them. No amount of enmity and discord is to bar us from dealing out justice to other people.

In short, the three stages of virtue described in the verse in question are not restricted by any limitations, and the Muslims are required to practise them in their dealings with all people

irrespective of caste or creed. We are called upon to follow the injunctions embodied in the verse under discussion in our dealings with every man that comes in contact with us, be he a Muslim or a non-Muslim, a subordinate or an officer, a ruler or a subject. We owe certain duties to our rulers just as they owe certain duties to us and we are bound to observe justice in discharging our duties to them. If the rulers fulfil their duty to the subject people, justice demands that the latter also should acquit themselves of their obligations to them. We can not individually protect our lives and property, and therefore it is necessary that there should be an organisation for the accomplishment of this object. Such an organisation is called government, and the duty that the government owes to us is that it should frame and enforce proper laws for the protection of our property, our lives and our honour. Our duty to the government is that we should respect the laws so framed and pay the expenses which the government has to incur in the discharge of its duties. The money so paid is called *zakat*, *jizya* or tax. If we respect the laws of the government and pay the legal taxes, we are not laying the government under any obligation. The government made laws for us and protected our lives, property and honour. Thus it did us a good. We return this good by respecting the laws and paying the taxes, and in doing so, we only obey the commandment. "Verily God enjoins justice." But have we done all that we were required to do? The Holy Quran requires us not to stop here, but to do more than this. We should also practise *Ihsan* (beneficence) in our relations with the government. The mere paying of taxes or the observance of the laws is not the highest virtue. We should share the burden of our government, fly to its assistance when it is confronted by difficulties, create facilities for it, chastise its enemies, and volunteer our services when it has to undertake great expeditions. If we do this, we are practising *Ihsan* (beneficence) in relation to the government, for these are things

that lie not on our heads as compulsory duties.

As for the British Government, I shall be guilty of injustice if I do not point out here that while in the case of of an average government, the services of the type mentioned above are not obligatory on the subject people, the British Government can justly claim them as of right, for it is not satisfied with the bare performance of its duty to its subject races, but has laid them under a deep obligation by bestowing upon them numerous favours which they could not claim as their due. If you want to realise what the British Government has done for the people of India, just compare the condition of this country and the development of its resources under the British rule with its condition in the time of our former rulers. How its lands have been turned into fruitful fields under the present administration. Think of the great facilities and the numerous means of comfort which the Government has provided for us. Consider education alone. How great facilities has it given the Indians to get themselves educated. If the Government had not bestowed these favours upon them, we had no right to demand them from it. The Government has been kind to us and something must be done in return for this kindness. Our Holy Prophet (upon whom be peace and the blessings of God) said, هل جزاء الاحسان الا الاحسان "The reward of kindness is naught but kindness."

I have already said that the requirements of justice in relation to a government are that the subject people should respect its laws and pay the legal taxes. But our beneficence in relation to a government would be to take such steps as are conducive to its stability, to assist in the realisation of its aims, to help it out of difficulties, and to stand by it in times of danger. Though as far as mere justice is concerned, we are not bound to provide all that a government may need, yet in

order to be *Muhsin* (beneficent) as the Holy Quran bids us to be, we must of our own accord supply all its needs. There is no denying the fact that under the present rule the Muslim community has produced men who have acted beneficently towards the British Government. But as I pointed out before, beneficence, though higher than justice, is attended with a weakness, for the man who does another person some good naturally desires for gratitude from the beneficiary. Hence it is not at all surprising, nor very objectionable, if those who render the state some service should wish for a recognition of their service by the government. It is but natural for them to do so. The gratitude of the government finds its expression in various forms. Titles, honours, estates, membership of councils, etc., are the various tokens by which the Governmet shows its recognition of the services rendered by its loyal and devoted subjects. I do not find fault with this, for a person naturally desires that his exertions in a good cause should meet with recognition. This desire also serves as a stimulus for the performance of many a noble and worthy deed. But the Holy Quran requires us to rise higher than this. We are not only to practise *adl* (justice) and *Ihsna* (beneficence) but also *Ita-i-zil Qurba, i.e.*, showing that pure form of kindness which one shows to one's kinsmen. This is the highest form of good which is done without wishing for or expecting any kind of reward or recognition. When a mother, for instance, lavishes her tender care on her child, she does not do so out of any desire for reward or recognition. Hers is a natural love which flows out spontaneously. We will be practising this highest and most unselfish form of virtue in relation to the Government if we render it services even without its knowledge and without looking for any reward from it. Hence in order to be a Muslim in the truest sense of the word, we should render service to the Government even when it does not know it and should banish from our minds all desire for requital, recognition or gratitude.

Our only consideration in serving the Government should be that as God has, out of His wisdom, placed us under it, and has entrusted to its care our properties, our lives and our honour, therefore it behoves us to take such measures as conduce to its stability and welfare, without caring to let the Government know of them and without cherishing any desire for reward or recognition. This is the highest moral as far as our treatment of our fellow beings is concerned, and it is not impossible to come up to this high ideal. If it had been impossible to practise this virtue, it would not have been enjoined in the Holy Quran, which unlike other books gives only such directions as are practicable. I know of many illustrious personages whose behaviour towards the British Government has been marked not merely by *adl* (justice) and *ihsan* (beneficence) but also by the higher moral which the Holy Quran describes as ایتاء ذی القربی *i.e.*, that form of kindness which one shows to one's kinsmen. The most conspicuous example among them was the late Mirza Ghulam Ahmad the Promised Messiah. He, not in the troubled days of 1907, when many were loud in their expressions of loyalty, but so far back as the year 1882, perceived through his superhuman discernment that certain people of this country had seditious tendencies which manifested themselves in a visible form in the last few years. From that time to the last moments of his life he continued to enjoin upon his co-religionists sincere loyalty to the British crown and to urge them to abstain from all seditious ideas and practices. He published a very large number of books and pamphlets during this period, and in most, if not all, of his writings he laid great emphasis on this point. These repeated and emphatic injunctions of his were regarded by some as mistimed vigilance and were ascribed by others to flattery, until at last in the year 1905 there came into existence a state of things which opened the eyes of all Muslims, and then they all did those very things which they had hitherto been holding as flattery. Some of them went so far as to do even such things as are not permitted by the law of

Islam. For instance at the death of King Edward VII, it was proposed to hold the service of *Janaza* which is allowed only for the Muslims. Whatever our sacred leader, the late Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, did in the interests of the British Government, he did not do out of any desire for reward. He asked for no titles from the Government. He sought no honour from it. He never went to any high official to make a display of the good services he was rendering to the Government, nor did he ever send any emissary to do that work for him. If he ever spoke of the service he had rendered to the Government, it was only in self-defence, *i. e.*, to refute the charges which were sometimes brought against him by his malicious opponents. He wrote some books in Arabic and Persian in which he dwelt upon the blessings of the British rule and declared Jehad against the British nation to be illegal. These books were sent by him to Egypt, Turkey, Persia and even Afghanistan. The service which he thus rendered to the British Government was of the class designated by the Holy Quran as إيتاء ذي القربى *i. e.*, that kind of good which one does to one's kinsmen. This was a service which the Government nevereven dreamed of.

The example of the revered founder of the Ahmadiyya movement makes it abundantly clear that it is quite possible for one to practise in relation to the Government that kind of goodness which the Holy Quran styles as إيتاء ذي القربى *i. e.*, that form of kindness which one shows to one's kindred. The Holy Quran bids us to do good to others without looking for any return from the party benefitted. But we have fallen so short of the high ideal set before us in the above and other verses of the Holy Quran that we are always seeking for opportunities to bring our services to the notice of the Government. However insignificant our service may be, we do not hesitate to represent it as a splendid piece of public service. We are so fond of display, that even when there is no real occasion for obliging the

Government, we create fictitious ones. We have taken for granted that the Government is afraid of agitation and political unrest. Hence even if there is no real unrest or disaffection, when we bethink ourselves of laying the Government under an obligation, or have some private purpose to fulfil, all that we have to do is to go to a high official with the alarming report that a riot is about to occur in the city, or that a section of our community cherishes seditious ideas, that such and such association of ours has relations with a foreign Muslim ruler, say the Amir of Kabul, that the students of such and such college of ours advocate the policy of the Indian National Congress or that certain influential members of our community—and these are men against whom we cherish a personal grudge—are in intriguing with the members of a non-Muslim community who have unfortunately come under the suspicion of the Government on account of their seditious or revolutionary tendencies. Our object in making these fictitious reports is no other than to alarm the Government, and when we find that our trick has been successful, the next thing that we have to do is to take upon ourselves the responsibility of averting the imaginary danger. A few days after we inform the Government that the mischief has been nipped in the bud and that now our community has returned to the original state. Generally we follow this course with two objects in view. Firstly we seek the ruin of our enemy whom we falsely accuse of being hostile to the Government, and secondly we try to pave our way for greater honours by laying the government under an obligation. By so doing we are guilty not only of deception and falsehood, but also of a much graver offence, of which we are perhaps unconscious. We play the traitor to our community. We betray an innocent and loyal community whose loyalty is not based on worldly motives, but has its fountain-head in the teachings of its sacred book and in the precepts of its Holy Prophet. We try to gain our selfish ends, the destruction of a

for the attainment of honour, at the sacrifice of our community.

Friends, is it an imaginary tale that I am telling you or is it based on facts? I wish it were all imaginary. God alone knows the secrets of the hearts and to Him alone are known all hidden things. But if the information which I have been receiving from very reliable sources, since 1907 is correct, then it is clear that certain members of our community have often been acting the traitor.

Call to your mind the time of 1907. That year I happened to go once to the Railway station at midnight. To my surprise I found the platform crowded with families of European gentlemen. They were walking up and down the platform and it so appeared that they were waiting for some ill news and were ready to take train and go to a place of safety as soon as the news was received. You will remember the sight witnessed at Lahore on the day when Lala Lajpat Rai was departed. You remember the arrival of artillery and the parade of troops in the city which, showed that the Government feared a rising in the city or in the mofussil and that it was taking precautionary steps to prevent it.

I often said to myself those days, that even if it were that our Hindu brethren had become disloyal to the Government, though such a supposition was not consistent with facts, seeing that those who incited the audience in the *Bharat Mata* could be counted by tens, and those who were influenced by such harangues were not more than a few hundreds, while there must have been thousands of Hindus who had no sympathy with the malcontents; but even if it were conceded that the greater portion of the Hindu community had turned against the Government, there was little ground for apprehension, when there was the loyal Muslim community to stand by their rulers in the time of danger. It was then quite inexplicable to me why European Head Clerks and other English gentlemen

working in the Government offices kept revolvers in their desks and inquired of Muslims whether they would keep aloof from the Hindus, if the latter rose against their European rulers. These are true facts. All this led one to suspect that both the Hindus and the Muslims were leagued againts the Government. I thought much, but in 1907, I could not see any ground for such apprehensions. It might be because I have no great aptitude for politics. But if what I heard afterwards is correct, I hold that all these apprehensions and precautions were just and proper. I am told that certain gentlemen who have made it their business to carry favour with the Government reported to the authorities that the Muslim community also had fallen a prey to the whiles of the Hindus and that both the communities were about to raise at standard of revolt against the Government. It was also hinted by the worthy informers that it was their prestige and influence which was holding back the Muslims from making a common cause with the Hindus and that if their influence were withdrawn, their co-religionists would at once go over to their non-Muslims neighbours and would bring about a state of things which would endaouger the very lives of the Anglo-Indians, and their families. If whole families of European gentlemen therefore hovered about the Railway Station at midnight to flee to a place of safety, it was a wise precaution under the circumstanees, and if the threatened junction of Muslims with non-Muslims did not come to pass, this fortunate circumstance was perhaps ascribed to the influence exerted by the gentlemen who acted as informers.

Ye thousands of men that are now assembled in this meeting and that are the residents of this great city! I ask you whether any seditious spirit was to be found in you in 1907, and whether you were so disloyal and mean as to plot against the authorities? Had you forgotten the teachings of the Holy Quran with regard to obedience and

loyality? Had the verse recited to you from pulpit every Friday faded from your memory? If you were unable to practise the two higher forms of virtue in relation to the Government, *viz.*, *Ihsan* (beneficence) and *Ita-i-Zil Qurba* (showing the kindness which one does to one's kindred), could you not discharge even those duties to the Government which justice demanded? If you had become destitute of all virtue were you not at least warned against disloyalty every Friday? You are Muslims and no Muslim can be guilty of treachery. You are a believer and no believer can wish his rulers ill. You are the followers of the Holy Quran and the Holy Quran enjoins obedienoe to authority upon its followers. God the Omniscient knows that my heart was wrung with anguish when I heard that the Muslim community was maliciously represented to the Government as harbouring seditious ideas. I heartily wish that all that I had heard (from trustworthy sources) should turu out to be untrue and unfounded. But if what I had heard is true, then it was certainly a very evil course which our friends adopted in order to creep into the good graces of the authorities or to bring about the ruin of their enemies. It was not betraying but killing the Muslim community. Now, if the authorities should discontinue the favours which they formerly bestowed on us on account of our being a backward community and ask us to help ourselves as best as we can, they will be quite justified in doing so, for we have been represented to them as a mean and despicable people that ill deserve any favour.

God knows better how far the report says the truth. But if alarming reports concerning the threatened alliance of the Hindus and the Muslims were really made to the high officials, and if the reporters actually volunteered to exert their influence to avert the alleged danger and then won the favour of the Government for nipping in the bud a conspiracy that had no zeal existence, the facts must be well known to the authorities.

Hence I deem it my bounden duty to respectfully inform them that if such reports were ever made they were false and slanderous. I believe that a person who is disobedient to the authorities is not a Muslim. Millions of Mussalmans were totally unaware of the doings of the year 1907. They never even dreamt of all that is said to have been imputed to them. It is easy to test the truth of my statement, and in this way. There is hardly any part of India which has been free from political agitation and intrigue during the past few years. Anarchism manifested itself in various forms. And all these parts had a large number of Muhammadans. East Bengal, some parts of which have been the centres of political agitation has more Muhammadans than Hindus. The number of the Mussalmans living in the various parts of India is not so small as to be subject to the influence of this individual or that. They number 70 millions, of whom six millions and a half, I may say, do not know even the names of the personages who thus claim to be exerting their influence with the Muslim community. Why is it then that never a Muslim was involved in any of the intrigues, riots, dacoities; thefts and outrages that have been the order of the day during the past few years in every part of India. If this was due to the influence of certain self-styled leaders, why is it that the influence of the Hindu leaders did not produce the same effect on their Hindu community? Are there no leaders among the Hindus or have all of them become hostile to Government? There must be thousands of distinguished personages in the Hindu community that regard the doings of their misguided brethren with horror, and must be exerting their influence with their members of their community. How was it then that the Mussalmans of India have taken no part in any of the proceedings against the British Government, and the only persons responsible for them were unfortunately their non-Muslim brethren. Such has unfortunately been the

case, but in my opinion, just as most of the respectable leaders of the Hindu community can not blamed for the misconduct of their brethren, similarly, the leaders of the Mussalman community can not claim any credit for the non-participation of the Muslims in the political crimes and agitation. It is Islam, and its Holy Founder and I may add, of the holy representatives of the Holy Prophet that have been appearing among the Muslims from time to time, that the credit is really due for the admirable attitude of the Muslim community to their foreign rulers, and not to these self-styled leaders.

The Muslim community has, however, proved its loyalty on many trying occasions. But it is not the political leaders to whom thanks are due for this. It is the lessons of obedience to authority given by the Holy Founder of Islam (on whom be peace and the blessings of God) that lie at the bottom of the law-abiding character of the Muslim people. He was so great an advocate of obedience to authority that he said اسمعوا واطيعوا وان استعمل عليكم عبد حبشي كان راسه زبيبة "Listen and obey even if a negro with a head covered with abscesses is put in authority over you." This saying of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) is given in the *Sahih Bukharee*, a work of undisputed authority on tradition.

Gentlemen, you are well aware that the negro has unfortunately been so long subjected to slavery that the words "negro" and "slave" have come to be regarded as practically synonymous. But the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) addressing a jealous people like the Arabs who were strangers to submission to foreign yoke, said that even if chance placed them under a deformed negro, they must bear to him implicit obedience. We are required to obey the authorities even in things that are disagreeable to us, though we are permitted to inform them respectfully of any

errors that they may commit. Dear friends, have you ever pondered over the almost mechanical way in which a congregation of devout Muslims follow the Imam (the man who leads the prayers) in every one of his movements and all of his postures? The congregation may include learned scholars, eminent theologians, men of wealth, and even a despotic ruler, they have no choice but to obey the *Imam* in all his acts. It is not unoften that the *Imam* errs, but we, in spite of being aware of his error, are not allowed to swerve even a hair's breadth from the course he follows. We are permitted to apprise him of his error, but that is to be done in the most admirable manner When he is going to make a mistake, we only say *Subhan allah* (*i.e.*, God is free from all defects). But if he, in spite of this warning, follows his own course, we are required to obey him even though we know him to be in the wrong. Sometimes he does not know his mistake until he finishes the prayer and we have to follow him in his mistaken course to the end. When he has ended his prayer, he is informed of his error, and when he has found out his mistake, he together with the congregation makes amends for it in the way prescribed. Herein there is an object lesson for the Muslims. Their conduct towards their *Amir* or ruler is to be modelled after their behaviour towards their *Imam* or leader in prayers. And this practical lesson is given them not once or twice, but it is repeated five times every day. They are taught to obey their rulers in every thing. If their rulers make any mistake, they may bring it to their notice in the most respectful manner, but are not allowed to disobey them even when they are in the wrong. Their commands are to be obeyed, be they right or wrong. The man who is placed in authority over us may be of mean or high extraction, he is to be obeyed under all circumstances. Islam teaches us to give the authorities good counsel freely when they need it and to respectfully point out any error which they may happen to commit, but in no case are their commands to be disobeyed.

We cannot sufficiently praise the Holy Prophet (on whom be peace and the blessings of God) who during his life-time solved all those difficulties and problems that were to confront us from time to time. This has not been done by any other book or teacher. Nay, I do not see any religion before Islam which throws any light on the relations that ought to exist between the rulers and the ruled, when they belong to different nationalities. The reason of this seems to be that at the time when most of the other religions were born, the world had not seen times in which one people were governed by another. But by the time when Islam came into the world, this state of things had come into existence. Besides, it was to be the final religion of the world. No other book was to come after it to supplement its teachings. Hence, unlike all other religions, it offers the solution of all the difficulties that were to arise in times to come.

The Prophet himself passed the early years of his ministry under a crude form of tribal rule which was a source of trouble to him in many respects, but neither he nor his followers ever infringed any of the laws or orders of that government. He and his followers bore unbearable suffering and persecution, but it can not be proved that he ever got up a secret plot against the then order of the society. When it was rendered impossible for his companions to live peacefully at home, he, instead of attempting to bring about the extirpation of the tyrants by secret conspiracies, exhorted his followers to leave for a neighbouring Christian Government and to live as the subjects of a Christian King. During his latter days he organised a republic of a very high order, the meanest pattern of which can be met with in the democratic Government of the United States of America. In short we, Muslims, have a perfect model in the life of the Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) for living under every form of Government. I have just said that the

Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) endured the persecution of the tribal misrule, and when he found the trouble too unendurable for his companions, he sent away Usman with seventeen men who set such a sublime and high example of perfect obedience, true submission and noble citizenship that being influenced thereby, in the course of time the entire dominion including the ruler and the ruled embraced the holy faith of Islam. This event teaches us a noble lesson of not only living in peace and order under an alien rule, but also of refraining from all secret plots and underhand conspiracies in case the tyranny of the rule exceed all bounds and become absolutely unbearable. What is allowable under such circumstances is that we should bid farewell to the Government as the Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) enjoined his followers to do. Thus, my brethren in faith, if God forbid, matters come to such a pass that you be unable to abide by the laws of the Government, for instance, if the Government should stand in your way of performing religious obligations or in any way interfere with your religious freedom or place any obstacle in the peaceful propagation of your faith, you have no right to rise, or hatch a secret plot, against it, but what is proper for you to do is to leave India for any other country. But so long as you live under a government, it is binding upon you, not as a matter of expediency or time-serving policy but as a religous duty, to abide by the government and the laws to the best of your ability and the utmost of your capacity.

Islam, your religion has also forbidden you to have anything to do with such government or nation as may not be on good terms with your own government, no matter the government or nation be your co-religionist. For instance if, God forbid, there break out a war between our rulers and the Amir of Asghanistan, it is entirely unlawful for a Muslim,

according to the religious code of Islam, to make any overt or covert attempt to aid the Amir of Afghanistan so long as he enjoys the protection of this government. He, the Muslim, will be in duty bound to shed his blood for his own government. This is what the Muslims have always done. In the last Afghanistan expedition Muslim hosts were also sent, and Muslim soldiers volunteered themselves to fight against the Afridis. Should, however, a Muslim be unable to bear such a war and cannot but do something against his own government, his action in this direction is looked upon by religion as nothing short of revolt. He should leave the country and thus throw off the yoke of subjection. Then and not till then he may do what he pleases. These are the immutable teachings of Islam which have the unmistakeable support of the Holy Writ and the words and deeds of the Prophet's himself (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). These noble teachings show beyond the least shadow of doubt that Islam lends no countenance to any sort of revolution or machination. You may get sick of your government. Islam does not take it ill. You may have reasonable grounds for so doing, but with all that Islam does not permit you to conspire underhandedly against your government. This is clear perfidy, however cruel the rule may be. You may openly quit the country to the knowledge of your rulers and then do as you like.

My friends consider and do justice in the name of God! a nation which has nothing in its hand but religion, a nation to whom that religion is the dearest concern, even dearer than life and honour, a nation which has clear and forcible injunctions from that very religion for the maintenance of loyalty and faithful attitude even towards a cruel ruler—can such a nation be possibly accused of disloyalty?

The German and Italian clergy are attempting wholesale

destruction of Islam by spreading a supposed terror under the name of Pan-Islamism. If Pan-Islamism is understood to mean that all Muslims living in different parts of the earth under different non-Muslim governments are unanimously planning to overthrow the Christian empires, and thus to renew afresh the glory of Islam, it is a falsehood which has been made up by mischief-mongers. At least the Muslims of India have leann hand about it. Whatever I have said, I have said on the basis of the Holy Book and the traditions. Is it not, therefore, sheer iniquity on my part to employ for the glory of Islam such means as are condemned by Islam itself. Religion is nothing but obedience to certain commandments, it is therefore obligatory on me as a follower of this religion to abide by, among other things, the order relating to unquestioning submission to the Government and real enmity with the enemies of the government. It is an odd inconsistency that in endeavouring to live in the service of my religion, I should wantonly allow myself to go against the express commandments of it. This crooked logic can not be conceived by a Muhammadan brain, but possibly by the ingenious brain of a German or an Italian Padri.

Consequently it must be said with all emphasis in the interests of truth that any body who takes pan-Islamism in the sense which some European Churchmen are giving it, is not a Muslim in the true meaning of the term. But if Pan-Islamism means that a Muslim should wish that all the human souls living on earth may become Muslims, and accept the truth of the Arabian Prophet, then I shall be the first to be proud of my love for Pan-Islamism, and for this I am prepared to undergo all punishment, for love for Islam and dissemination of Islam has sunk into my blood. I don't wish for any Islamic government nor desire any Islamic empire. What I do long for is this that whoever be the ruler, the whole world may turn Muslim. When my ancestors under Usman were able by dint

of noble example and force of unsullied character to convert a Christian ruler to Islam, there is no reason why I should not pray to God for a high degree of piety and godliness and righteousness coupled with perfect obedience and submission to the government so that the force of my and my brethren's electrifying example may win over for Islam, if not His Majesty King George, any of his descendants. May God prosper King eorge and his mighty empire. Really we, Muslims, who belong to different sects have enjoyed such comfort as we can not enjoy under any other government. Here we have religious freedom to an extent unknown in Afghanistan, Persia, Turkey, Syria, and Arabia. It is the blessing of this very Government that I am freely unfolding my ideas, otherwise in Afghanistan if a Hindu make bold to say even by way of prayer that His Majesty the Amir may turn Hindu, he is sure to be stoned to death. In short the significance which the European clergy put upon the term "Pan-Islamism" is absolutely humbug for us Indians. There is no doubt that we raised a subscription for the Tripoli war and even approached the benign Goverment with a petition for interfering with a view to putting a stop to the war, for, we, Muslims, felt great mental pain on account of the outrages and atrocities said to be perpetrated there by Italians. But is it, I ask, an unlawful deed? Certainly not! Even in England the brutalities of Italians were looked upon with contempt, even there the war is denounced, even there like us the government was requested to interfere and put a stop to the war. If a subscription was opened for the aid of the martyrs and the wounded of the war, it was so done with the permission of His Excellency the Viceroy. If meetings were held here to deliberate over the Persian problem, they were presided over by Lord Lamington there. I saw these events and then pondered over the international principles set forth in the works on the subject with a view to see if there was anything running counter to British neutral policy, but I could find nothing there to

tamper with the British neutrality. We are perfectly aware that the policy of our Government is strictly neutral with regard to the Turko-Italian war. If we send an army from this place for the aid of either party, we will surely be breaking the neutral policy of our rulers. But whatever has been done in this respect by the Indian Muslims does in no way clash with the avowed principles of neutrality. Even if, God forbid, the Government happens to openly side with Italy and enter the lists against the Turks and Arabs, we shall first humbly beseech the Government to desist from such an intention. But if the Government be not able to hold back from its intention, it will even then be absolutely unlawful for Muslims to do against our Government even what we are now doing against Italy or Russia. It will then be our bounden duty to continue loyal to the Government or to leave its protection and the cuntry uuder it. There is no doubt that wherever there lives a Muslim, he is to us our brother and we naturally sympathise with him in his woe. It is quite natural. If we say otherwise, it will be false and against the course of nature. But natural sympathy in woe does not mean that we should stray away from the path of submission.